Dillon Resource Management Plan
ID Team Meeting

September 9, 2002
1:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Attendees: Renee Johnson, Marilyn Krause, Lynn Anderson, Bob Gunderson, Rob Van Deren, John Simons, Jeff Daugherty, Huey Long, Joe Casey, Mark Sant, Paul Hutchinson, Laurie Blinn, Brad Gillespie, Jim Roscoe, Brian Hockett, Andrea Wiggins, Steve Armiger

Renee introduced Marilyn Krause, Public Affairs Specialist in the Butte FO, to the ID Team. Marilyn was asked to facilitate the ID Team Meeting. Marilyn stated that her role as a facilitator is to keep things moving. She displayed the following meeting goal:

- Complete table review by 4:30 p.m. Tuesday

The ID Team reviewed the agenda. During the last meeting, the team agreed to try to have Wednesday of this week as work day where specialists could work individually. To do this, the team needs to work through the Comparison of Alternatives Table and discuss all the changes by Tuesday at 4:30 p.m.

Jim Melton from Dynamac will be here Thursday at 8:30 a.m. to meet with the staff on "Roadmapping". This is a tool which may help the team move through alternative development more quickly.

Huey requested that a discussion of slumps, slips, and landslides be added to the agenda. This discussion will take place on Thursday or Friday.

RAC Recommendations
The RAC met in Dillon on September 5. Renee displayed the RAC's recommendations regarding Wild and Scenic Rivers and Travel Management on a flipchart as follows:

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Subgroup recommended to RAC
- 5 segments not suitable (consensus)
- 3 segments no consensus (all but 1 member felt that the wilderness segment was suitable)

RAC recommended to BLM
- Accept subgroup recommendations
- Look at information provided by subgroup on non-consensus rivers (Madison) when reviewing suitability.

Travel Management

Subgroup recommended to RAC
- Use the subgroup's principles for travel designation
- Use maps/recommended routes as a place to start in conjunction with principles
- Anticipate some changes, but essentially there

<u>RAC recommended to BLM</u>
- Adopt the principles for travel designation, but modify the last principle to ensure it includes BLM and administrative use.
- Remove designation of specific mapped "play area" and instead develop criteria to be considered for "play areas".
- Use the maps and principles as a starting point, with caveats to make sure to:
  - 1) Review where public access exists (and don't designate where it doesn't exist)
  - 2) Consider resource concerns

<u>Travel Bottomline</u>
Rick is providing maps as requested to RAC members who may/will provide concerns they may have back to Rick by Mid-October.

BLM will use subgroup maps as a starting point and look at access and resource concerns.

Loose Ends
Renee followed up with WO staff regarding the format of the Comparison of Alternatives table. The WO does not want us to deviate from the main headings outlined in WO IB-2002-056, but did say that we can add sections to the table. We added unauthorized use, facilities (combined with transportation), and tribal treaty rights as new sections. We need to keep the utility and communication corridors section separate from lands and realty. The WO wants a common format for RMPs so that people know where to find information in the documents.

The WO agreed that the no action alternative for the ACEC section would be the following:
- No ACEC designations, but determine impacts on the nominations that meet the relevance and importance criteria.

Renee met with Jon Raby and it was decided that in the goal statements for Resources, social and economic language wouldn't be used. This related to following up on one of the Vegetation–Forests and Woodlands goals.

Expectations, Ground Rules, and Decision-Making
Marilyn displayed the following expectations, ground rules, and decision-making process for this meeting:

Expectations:
- Everyone participates constructively
- Staff specialists lead discussion for their program
- Focus on proposed changes (yellow highlights)
- Leave hard constraints discussion for another meeting

Ground Rules:
- Demonstrate mutual respect for all participants
- Avoid disruptive discussions—stick to the task at hand
- Make your comments succinct

Decision-Making Process:
- Thumbs up or to the side indicates support or "can live with it." Thumbs down indicates disagreement and Renee will approach management for direction.

The team next continued to review and edit the No Action/Current Management portion of the Comparison of Alternatives Table.

During the table review, the team agreed on the following:
- Move all specific acquisition suggestions to the Lands and Realty section. We will coordinate with the SO on whether specific tracts should be left in; coordinate with Jeff, et.al.
- Need to relook at all Resource Use goals and be consistent with inclusion or non-inclusion of an economic statement within the goal.
- All trespass/unauthorized use will be discussed under the Unauthorized Use section.
- Specific withdrawal proposals should be put under the Lands and Realty section.
- Geothermal will be addressed in the Leasable Minerals section instead of Renewable Energy.

September 10, 2002
8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

The team continued to review and edit the No Action/Current Management portion of the Comparison of Alternatives Table.

Hard Constraints

Renee clarified what constitutes a hard constraint and provided some background information. When the core team met with Rob, there was some discussion about the MSA Digest and how we would do that. At this meeting, the county proposed that the MSA Digest include hard constraints for each program, so that the public wouldn't comment about changing things that are hard constraints. There was also some discussion on soft constraints. However, it seems as though if something is not a hard constraint, it's a soft constraint, so soft constraints will not be discussed. The team previously received an example of hard constraints, which was just a listing of laws, regulations, policies, etc. It was later brought out that this was not adequate information for identifying hard constraints. Not all laws are hard constraints because they don't all require us to do something. Most always, hard constraints will be management common to all alternatives since they cannot be changed.

Renee listed the following on a flipchart:
- Hard constraint: A required element that cannot change through the planning process. These are things we must do rather than things we can do.
- There are probably process constraints and resource constraints (it was discussed that it's not necessarily important to make that distinction).

The team decided to review hard constraints in the Comparison of Alternatives Table. After reviewing several hard constraints listed in the table, there was some discussion about whether the team thought the review was necessary. After a lunch break, the team was presented with the following two options:
- Review the remainder of the highlighted items (hard constraints) for information only
- Not review the remainder of the highlighted items (hard constraints)—go onto another agenda item

The team decided to not review the remainder of the highlighted items and to go onto another agenda item.

After some discussion, the team decided to deal with hard constraints in the following manner:
- Have an Appendix to synopsize laws. Rely on WO language as much as possible.
- Have a bulleted list of laws, regulations, executive orders, etc. at the beginning of each section of Chapter 3.
- At this time, don't try to put all the laws into the Comparison of Alternatives Table.

SIMPPLLE Model
Brad talked with Tim O'Neil at the Forest Service regarding the SIMPPLLE Model. The Forest Service will have a training session for SIMPPLLE on October 2 and 3. Brad, Laurie, and John S. will attend the training. Brad thought that if he and Laurie could learn how to operate the model, specialists could then provide them information to put into the system. This model should help with alternative development and cumulative effects for the RMP.

ELUs
Joe reviewed the history of the ELU map modifications. Joe, Jim, and John initially reviewed the ecosystem management unit map and tweaked it by hand. After the revisions, the new map was similar to the NRIS Eco-Units map. Joe, Jim, John, and Brad then grouped forests, shrublands, grasslands, and the old grass. Mark Goeden also made suggested modifications to the map. Review of other RMPs shows that RMPs often don't impose management units. The team agreed that this approach wouldn't be used due to the complexity of splitting the planning area into subunits and the uncertainty of whether this would assist with analysis.

The satellite vegetation data will be split into grassland, shrubland, willow, aspen, woodland, and forest categories, which will be used as the base vegetation. After the vegetation data is rematched with the ownership coverage, Laurie will get the acreages for each of the categories.

Review Deadlines and Assignments
The team modified the table of assignments and deadlines as shown below.

Task	Assigned To	By When
Beaverhead County Roads Rob is following up with commissioners	Rob	8/19/02
Potential ACEC Boundaries Renee will talk with Mark G.	Mark G.	will determine after 8/29/02
ACEC Information Report	Andrea and Mark G.	October?
Riparian Corrections still needs some mapping–Jim will get reaches on map to Laurie	Jim with Laurie	9/9/02

Task	Assigned To	By When
Forest Vegetation Quality Control Renee will call Beth and ask her when this should be done	Joe, Laurie, and Beth	9/9/02
Draft of Chapter 1	Renee and Andrea	10/18/02
Draft of Chapter 3	Everyone	10/18/02
Deadline on Time Extension	Rob, FM, and Renee	10/18/02
ID Team Meeting	Everyone	10/21-24/02
ID Team Meeting	Everyone	11/18-22/02
ID Team Meeting	Everyone	12/2-6/02
ID Team Meeting	Everyone	1/13-17/03

The team discussed data needs and determined Laurie's priority workload to be as follows (with #1 as highest priority and non-numbered items as lowest priority):

> 1-FARSITE
> 1-County Roads
> 2-ACEC boundaries
> 3-Habitat Type Summation
> 4-SIMPPLLE Model
> 5-Disposal Retention
> 5-Finish Withdrawal Cleanup
> VRM Zones (seek assistance from MSO and Beth)
> Westslope Cutthroat Trout Coverage (minor)
> Riparian mapping (2-3 days)

After the entire team met, interested specialists met with Huey regarding slumps, slips, and landslides. Specialists circled known areas of slumps, slips, and landslides on a map. This information will be digitized.

September 12, 2002
8:30 a.m. to 12:10 p.m.

Buck West and Jim Melton from Dynamac met with the team to give a presentation on "Roadmapping". Roadmapping is a database program that may assist with alternative development for the RMP. They also offered facilitation services in conjunction to the program. After the presentation, the team expressed their opinions regarding the program and whether they thought this or some other contracted service would be useful for the RMP. Renee and others will get additional information regarding this program.